

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

RUTH RICHTER,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,  
and ANDREW M. SAUL, Commissioner of  
Social Security Administration;

Defendants.

**8:19CV340**

**ORDER**

IT IS ORDERED:

1. Filing No. 34, Plaintiff's objection to the court's order granting Defendants second motion for extension of time, treated as a motion for reconsideration, is denied.<sup>1</sup>
2. Filing No. 35, Plaintiff's motion for ceasing withdrawal of SSI benefits, is denied without prejudice.

Dated this 29th day of May, 2020.

BY THE COURT:



Richard G. Kopf  
Senior United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> Filing No. 34 includes a 1-page document which is captioned "Notice of Appeal of May 7, 2020 Order," but which contains no body. This document has not been docketed as a notice of appeal because it does not "name the court to which the appeal is taken," as required by the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. *See* FRAP 3(c)(1)(c) (also requiring that the name of the party taking the appeal be specified, and that the judgment, order, or part thereof being appealed be designated). Thus, the clerk of court could not be certain that Plaintiff was actually intending to appeal to a higher court (*e.g.*, the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit). If that is Plaintiff's intent, she will need to file another notice of appeal that contains all of the required information.